

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
5

6 RITA LEGAR, et al.,
7 Plaintiffs,
8 v.
9 LANDRY'S, INC.,
10 Defendant.

Case No. 2:20-cv-02274-RFB-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 27]

11 Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion for leave to file a second amended complaint.
12 Docket No. 27. A party seeking leave to amend a pleading "must attach the proposed amended
13 pleading to a motion seeking leave of the court to file an amended pleading." LR 15-1(a). Here,
14 Plaintiffs attach a proposed second amended complaint to their motion seeking leave to amend.
15 See Docket No. 27-1. Defendant's response addresses that proposed second amended complaint.
16 See Docket No. 34. In their reply brief, however, Plaintiffs attach and ask the Court for leave to
17 file an entirely different proposed second amended complaint. *Compare* Docket No. 27-1 with
18 Docket No. 37-1. Courts generally disregard arguments first raised in a reply brief because the
19 timing of the argument deprives the opposing party of the opportunity to respond. *See, e.g.,*
20 *Provenz v. Miller*, 102 F.3d 1478, 1483 (9th Cir. 1996). Plaintiffs' request for leave to file a
21 different second amended complaint violates the Court's Local Rules and is improperly attached
22 to their reply brief.

23 Accordingly, Plaintiffs' motion for leave to file a second amended complaint, Docket No.
24 27, is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: June 1, 2021

27
28 
Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge